

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

DECISION RECORD

CLIFF RIDGE CAMPGROUND

DOI-BLM-UT-G010-2021-0102-EA

September 2024

Location:
T 5S R.24E Sections 7&8
Salt Lake Meridian

Vernal Field Office
170 South 500 East
Vernal, Utah 84078
435-781-4400
435-781-4499 (Fax)



BLM

CLIFF RIDGE RECREATION ENHANCEMENT

DOI-BLM-UT-G010-2021-0102-EA DECISION RECORD

1.0 DECISION

It is my decision to approve the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Cliff Ridge Campground, upgrading Uintah County claimed road 100907, issuing a BLM right of way for both (Township 5 South, Range 24 East, Section 8 SWNW, SENW, NWSW, NESW and Section 7 SENE, NESE, SESE), and closing ½ mile buffer around the campground to dispersed camping (hereafter called the Selected Alternative). The Selected Alternative would result in the disturbance of approximately 28 acres by the campground and road, and the closure of approximately 774 acres to dispersed camping. The Selected Alternative includes Design Features. In accordance with 40 CFR § 1501.6(d), the Monitoring and Compliance Plan for the Design Features is included in this Decision Record as Attachment 1, and is integral to the Selected Alternative.

Should the facilities be constructed under contract, the BLM's authorized Contracting Officer Representative would monitor construction. Should the facilities be constructed using BLM internal resources, BLM Engineering staff would be responsible for monitoring the construction. The BLM's staff including but not limited to recreation specialists, seasonals, rangers, and law enforcement officers would conduct and monitor the operation and maintenance needed to manage the recreation site.

Authorized Officer, Date

Ryan L Bankart 9/24/24

2.0 RATIONALE

The decision to authorize the Selected Alternative has been made in consideration of the information disclosed in DOI-BLM-UT-G010-2021-0102-EA and the significance findings in the Finding of No Significant Impact. Some of the considerations are summarized in the following subsections.

2.1 PURPOSE AND NEED

The Selected Alternative meets the BLM's stated purpose and need of addressing adverse resource impacts from existing recreation and diversifying recreational opportunities in the Cocklebur Flat area. The Selected Alternative diversifies recreational opportunities by creating formal camping and an overlook as well as improving motorized access to the Cocklebur Flat area by upgrading the existing road. The Selected Alternative addresses adverse resource impacts

by allowing for reclamation of proliferated routes and providing developed camping in the area, removing dispersed camping from 774 acres, and providing restroom facilities and trash cans for recreationists.

2.2 PLAN CONFORMANCE AND CONSISTENCY

As described in the EA Section 1.3, the Selected Alternative is in conformance with the VFO Resource Management Plan (RMP) Record of Decision (BLM, 2008) as amended (BLM, 2015). Although the selected alternative is not specifically mentioned in the plan, the specific decisions that authorize this type of action include the Goals and Objectives for Recreational Resources, REC-8, REC-12, REC-18, and SRMA-1.

The Utah Greater Sage-grouse RMP Amendment Record of Decision (BLM, 2015) contains required design features applicable to the road upgrade. The EA Appendix C documents the consideration and application of those measures.

The Selected Alternative is also consistent with the RMP's other objectives, goals, and decisions as they relate to project area and the recreation program. It has been determined that the selected alternative would not conflict with other decisions throughout the plan.

2.3 ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

The EA analyzed two alternatives in detail, the Selected Alternative (called the Proposed Action in the EA) and the No Action Alternative. The No Action Alternative was not selected because it did not meet the BLM's purpose and need to address ongoing resource degradation and to diversify recreation opportunities in the Cocklebur Flat area.

The EA also analyzed five additional alternatives but dismissed those alternatives from detailed analysis for the reasons stated in the EA Section 2.3.

2.4 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

Public scoping was held from May 4, 2022, through June 6, 2022. The BLM received 20 scoping letters. The BLM considered the issues and alternatives raised by these parties during the public scoping period while preparing this Environmental Assessment.

In addition, the BLM held a public comment period from August 2, 2024, through September 4, 2024. The BLM received 21 comment letters. Eight of the commenters were against the proposal. Nine of the commenters were in favor of the proposal. The remaining commenters did not express a preference. The BLM summarized and responded to substantive comments in the EA Appendix E.

2.5 CONSULTATION

Name	Purpose and Authorities	Findings and Conclusions
Utah State Historic Preservation Office	National Historic Preservation Action Section 106	The BLM consulted Utah State Historic Preservation Office on a determination of “No Historic Properties Affected” for this project on 3/31/2022. The Utah SHPO concurred with this determination on 4/1/2022.
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	Endangered Species Act Section 7	Consultation was not necessary following analysis within chapter 3 and two years of surveys showing no Mexican spotted owl occupancy. The BLM has reached a “No Effect” determination for this action.
Native American Tribes	Government to Government Consultation Policy	There are no identified Native American Religious concerns for this project. Consultation for impacts from this project were initiated with Native American Tribes for the Class III survey U21BL0223 by letter mailed 11/08/2022. BLM received no responses. No Native American sites were identified within the project location.
State of Utah Department of Natural Resources (DNR)	Greater Sage Grouse Coordination	The BLM consulted with the Utah Division of Wildlife Resources (UDWR) regarding potential impacts of the proposed construction on greater sage grouse and its habitat(s). Concurrence was reached that the project is in Appendix C.
State of Utah Trust Lands Administration	Cooperating Agency	The Trust Lands Administration (TLA) is a cooperating agency for this project. The BLM coordinated with the TLA during development of this EA. The TLA was asked for input in 2022 and given the opportunity to review the draft EA prior to its publication for public comment but provided no input. They did not submit a comment letter during the public comment period, and they were not mentioned in the letter from Utah’s Public Lands Policy Coordinating Office.
State of Utah Division of State Parks (Utah State Parks)	Cooperating Agency	Utah State Parks is a cooperating agency for this project. The BLM coordinated with Utah State Parks during development of this EA. Utah State Parks was asked for input in 2022 and given the opportunity to review the draft EA prior to its publication for public comment but provided no input. They did not submit a comment letter during the public comment period, and they were not mentioned in the letter from Utah’s Public Lands Policy Coordinating Office.
Uintah County	Cooperating Agency and Improvement of a county-claimed road	Uintah County is a cooperating agency for this project. The BLM coordinated with Uintah County during development of this EA. Uintah County was asked for input in 2022. The BLM conducted an onsite visit with a Uintah County agent on February 14, 2024. The County commissioners were notified of the proposed improvement of Uintah County claimed road 100907. A letter of acknowledgement was received on March

Name	Purpose and Authorities	Findings and Conclusions
		18, 2024. Uintah County was also given the opportunity to review the draft EA prior to its publication for public comment, but provided no further input at that time. They did not submit a comment letter during the public comment period.
U.S. National Parks Service Dinosaur National Monument	Cooperating Agency and Proximity to the Park	The National Park Service (NPS) Dinosaur National Monument is a cooperating agency for this project. The BLM coordinated with the NPS during development of this EA. The NPS was asked for input in 2022. The BLM conducted a virtual meeting with the Monument Superintendent to present information on the proposal. The NPS was also given the opportunity to review the draft EA prior to its publication for public comment and the Monument's Resource Stewardship and Science Program Leader attended a site visit with BLM employees including field managers on August 2, 2024. Following this, the NPS requested the BLM add images of the viewshed to the Split Mountain Stargazing Area, the Cub Creek Valley Overlook, and the Quarry Exhibit Hall parking lot from the proposed Overlook to the Visual Analysis images, which the BLM did (see Appendix D). The NPS also identified a peregrine falcon nest across from Placer Point and requested consideration in the design features and Interdisciplinary Team Checklist, which the BLM has updated. During the public comment period, the NPS requested removal of the pavilion or re-siting its proposed placement downslope from the ridge top and collaboration on night sky and interpretive information. See Appendix D for a response to their comments.

3.0 PROTEST AND APPEAL

This decision may be appealed to the Interior Board of Land Appeals, Office of the Secretary, in accordance with the regulations contained in 43 CFR, Part 4. If an appeal is taken, your notice of appeal must be filed in the authorizing office within 30 days from receipt of this decision. The appellant has the burden of showing that the decision appealed from is in error. If you wish to file a petition pursuant to regulation 43 CFR 4.21 for a stay of the effectiveness of this decision during the time that your appeal is being reviewed by the Board, the petition for a stay must accompany your notice or appeal. A petition for a stay is required to show sufficient justification based on the standards listed below. Copies of the notice of appeal and petition for a stay must also be submitted to each party named in this decision and to the Interior Board of Land Appeals and to the appropriate Office of the Solicitor (see CFR 4.413) at the same time the original documents are filed with this office. If you request a stay, you have the burden of proof to demonstrate that a stay should be granted.

Standards for Obtaining a Stay

Except as otherwise provided by law or other pertinent regulation, a petition for a stay of a decision pending appeal shall show sufficient justification based on the following standards:

- (1) The relative harm to the parties if the stay is granted or denied
- (2) The likelihood of the appellant's success on the merits
- (3) The likelihood of immediate and irreparable harm if the stay is not granted, and
- (4) Whether the public interest favors granting the stay

If you appeal this decision, please provide this office with a copy of your Statement of Reasons.

ATTACHMENT 1: MONITORING AND COMPLIANCE PLAN

In accordance with 40 CFR § 1501.6(d), the following sections describe for each design features: the party(ies) responsible for their implementation, how monitoring information will be made publicly available if appropriate, the anticipated implementation/completion timeframe, the standards for determining compliance, the consequences of non-compliance, and the mitigation funding source.

DESIGN FEATURE 1: MIGRATORY BIRDS

No migratory bird nests are anticipated in the construction area because it is actively used by dispersed campers and OHVs. However, BLM would conduct a site-specific survey for nesting migratory birds seven to 10 days before construction begins if construction is scheduled during the migratory bird nesting season from April 1 to July 15. If active nests are found during the survey, the BLM will minimize construction within 100-feet of them until they are no longer active. If active nests are not present, construction would proceed. If construction begins before April 1 and continues into the nesting season, the timing would not apply.

Party(ies) responsible for implementation: Bureau of Land Management.

How monitoring information will be made publicly available if appropriate: Freedom of Information Act Requests.

Anticipated implementation/completion timeframe: During construction, which is currently unscheduled but anticipated to occur in May to October in a future year.

The standards for determining compliance: Nest surveys seven to 10 days before construction begins if construction is scheduled during the migratory bird nesting season from April 1 to July 15.

The consequences of non-compliance: Consequences for “take” of a migratory bird or its nest are defined by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and enforced by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

Mitigation funding source: BLM base funding.

DESIGN FEATURE 2: RAPTORS

No active raptor nests are known within the species-specific buffer distances of the construction area, and none are anticipated because it is actively used by dispersed campers and OHVs. However, if active raptor nests are discovered during construction, to the extent possible the BLM would apply the species appropriate timing and spatial buffers described in the VFO RMP Appendix A until the nests are no longer active. If active nests are not present, construction would proceed. If construction begins before the Appendix A timings and continues into the nesting season, the timing would not apply.

Party(ies) responsible for implementation: Bureau of Land Management

How monitoring information will be made publicly available if appropriate: Freedom of Information Act Requests

Anticipated implementation/completion timeframe: During construction, which is currently unscheduled but anticipated to occur in May to October in a future year.

The standards for determining compliance: If active raptor nests are discovered during construction, appropriate to the extent possible of timing and spatial buffers described in the VFO RMP Appendix A until the nests are no longer active

The consequences of non-compliance: Consequences for “take” of a raptor or its nest are defined by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and enforced by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

Mitigation funding source: BLM base funding.

DESIGN FEATURE 3: RESERVED

The BLM deleted this Design Feature due to conversations with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service which determined there was no effect to Mexican spotted owl and therefore no need for impact reducing measures.

DESIGN FEATURE 4: BALD EAGLES

BLM would conduct a site-specific survey for roosting bald eagles if construction is scheduled from November 1 to March 31st. Construction activities would avoid occupied bald eagle roosting sites by a 0.5-mile buffer while the roost is occupied, assumed to be 0.5 hour before dusk until approximately 0.5 hour after dawn. If eagles are not present, construction would proceed.

Party(ies) responsible for implementation: Bureau of Land Management.

How monitoring information will be made publicly available if appropriate: Freedom of Information Act Requests.

Anticipated implementation/completion timeframe: During construction, which is currently unscheduled but anticipated to occur in May to October in a future year.

The standards for determining compliance: Avoidance of occupied bald eagle roosting sites by a 0.5-mile buffer while the roost is occupied, assumed to be 0.5 hour before dusk until approximately 0.5 hour after dawn.

The consequences of non-compliance: Consequences for “take” of a bald eagle are defined by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act and enforced by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

Mitigation funding source: BLM base funding.

DESIGN FEATURE 5: PRONGHORN

The project area contains Utah Division of Wildlife Services crucial yearlong pronghorn antelope habitat. No pronghorn are anticipated in the construction area because it is actively used by dispersed campers and OHVs. However, BLM would conduct a site-specific survey for pronghorn if construction is scheduled from December 1 to April 30. If pronghorn are present, construction activities would not take place until pronghorn have vacated the area unless it is determined through analysis and coordination with Utah Division of Wildlife Resources (UDWR) that impacts could be avoided or minimized considering factors such as snow depth, temperature, snow crusting, location of disturbance, forage quantity and quality, and animal condition. If pronghorn are not present, construction would proceed.

Party(ies) responsible for implementation: Bureau of Land Management.

How monitoring information will be made publicly available if appropriate: Freedom of Information Act Requests.

Anticipated implementation/completion timeframe: During construction, which is currently unscheduled but anticipated to occur in May to October in a future year.

The standards for determining compliance: A survey for pronghorn if construction is scheduled from December 1 to April 30 and delay of construction activities until pronghorn have vacated the area unless it is determined through analysis and coordination with Utah Division of Wildlife Resources (UDWR) that impacts could be avoided or minimized.

The consequences of non-compliance: Deviation from implementation of the design feature as proposed would remain consistent with the management objective of the area therefore there are no consequences of non-compliance. However, the effects of non-compliance are stress to and displacement of pronghorns.

Mitigation funding source: BLM base funding.

DESIGN FEATURE 6: WEEDS

To reduce impacts from weeds:

- To help prevent the spread of invasive species (cheatgrass) and the creation of additional hazardous fuels, any reclaimed areas would be seeded with fire-tolerant bunchgrasses.
- The BLM would conduct weed control in and around the campground in accordance with the Vernal Planning Area Invasive Weed Management Plan.

Party(ies) responsible for implementation: Bureau of Land Management.

How monitoring information will be made publicly available if appropriate: Freedom of Information Act Requests.

Anticipated implementation/completion timeframe: During construction, which is currently unscheduled but anticipated to occur in May to October in a future year. During facility maintenance for the life of the campground as determined necessary through monitoring.

The standards for determining compliance: Completion of weed surveys and treatments.

The consequences of non-compliance: Deviation from implementation of the design feature as proposed would remain consistent with the management objective of the area therefore there are no consequences of non-compliance. However, the effects of non-compliance are the potential establishment and spread of weed species.

Mitigation funding source: BLM base funding, contract funding, or weed agreement funding.

DESIGN FEATURE 7: VISIBILITY

To reduce visibility from key observation points:

- All proposed permanent infrastructure would be painted a color from the 9 standard environmental colors, as found in Standard Environmental Colors Chart CC-001, to match colors found in the dominant landscape and using a nonreflective paint to reduce visibility.
- If metal were used to construct the observation platform, kiosks, or other project components on the proposed overlook (see section 2.2.1), they would be positioned or designed to prevent light reflecting to the Dinosaur National Monument.
- Minimal vegetation would be removed during campground or associated facility construction to maintain vegetative screening.

Party(ies) responsible for implementation: Bureau of Land Management:

How monitoring information will be made publicly available if appropriate: Freedom of Information Act Requests.

Anticipated implementation/completion timeframe: During construction, which is currently unscheduled but anticipated to occur in May to October in a future year. During facility maintenance for the life of the campground as determined necessary through monitoring.

The standards for determining compliance: Appropriately painted facilities, facility reflective surfaces faced away from potentially visible Dinosaur National Monument key observation points, and retention of trees.

The consequences of non-compliance: Deviation from implementation of the design feature as proposed would remain consistent with the management objective of the area therefore there are no consequences of non-compliance. However, the effects of non-compliance are the potential for the campground, its facilities, or its visitors to be visible from the key observation points.

Mitigation funding source: BLM base funding or contract funding.

DESIGN FEATURE 8: EROSION

To reduce impacts from erosion:

- To minimize adverse impacts to soils and surface water quality, if washouts or cutting were observed during and after construction due to water or erosion events, the BLM would implement erosion control measures (e.g. fiber rolls, silt fences, or similar) or implement other Best Management Practices (BMPs) as listed by the Utah Division of Water Quality through the Utah Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (UPDES).
- Southeast of the campground, the BLM would implement erosion control measures (e.g. fiber rolls, silt fences, or similar) during construction or the life of the roll to help restrict or direct water flow on roads and ditches.

Party(ies) responsible for implementation: Bureau of Land Management.

How monitoring information will be made publicly available if appropriate: Freedom of Information Act Requests.

Anticipated implementation/completion timeframe: During construction, which is currently unscheduled but anticipated to occur in May to October in a future year. During facility maintenance for the life of the campground as determined necessary through monitoring.

The standards for determining compliance: Remediation of erosion through installation of erosion control measures.

The consequences of non-compliance: Deviation from implementation of the design feature as proposed would remain consistent with the management objective of the area therefore there are no consequences of non-compliance. However, the effects of non-compliance are the potential for sedimentation into waterways and damage to site facilities.

Mitigation funding source: BLM base funding or contract funding.

DESIGN FEATURE 9: GREATER SAGE-GROUSE

Approximately 1 acre of the proposed road upgrade is in Greater Sage-grouse Primary Habitat Management Area and is also wintering and brood rearing habitat. No sage-grouse are anticipated in the construction area because it is actively used by dispersed campers and OHVs. However, to comply with the 2015 Utah Greater Sage-Grouse Approved Resource Management Plan Amendment's (ARMPA) decision MA-SSS-3 (see this EA's Appendix C), BLM would conduct a site-specific survey for Greater Sage-grouse if construction is scheduled from November 15 through Mar 15 (winter timing), and April 15-Aug 15 (brood rearing timing). If greater-sage grouse are discovered BLM would not upgrade the portion of the road within the PHMA from during those timeframes. unless it is determined through analysis and coordination

with Utah Division of Wildlife Resources that impacts do not exist or could be minimized considering factors such as snow depth, temperature, snow crusting, location of disturbance, forage quantity and quality, and animal condition. If sage grouse are not present, construction would proceed.

Monitoring is required as outlined in the Vernal RMP as amended by the ARMPA. See Section 1.3 of the EA which contains the monitoring language of MA-SSS-3.

DESIGN FEATURE 10: PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES

To prevent impacts to paleontological resources, if excavations (i.e. for the proposed vault toilets) encountered potentially fossiliferous layers such as cobble-sized rocks or sediment that is dark red to purple, excavations would halt and a BLM-approved paleontological monitor would monitor any continued digging at that site.

Party(ies) responsible for implementation: Bureau of Land Management.

How monitoring information will be made publicly available if appropriate: Freedom of Information Act Requests.

Anticipated implementation/completion timeframe: During construction only, which is currently unscheduled but anticipated to occur in May to October in a future year.

The standards for determining compliance: If fossils are encountered, paleontological monitoring of the construction.

The consequences of non-compliance: Consequences for fossil resource damage or destruction are defined by the Paleontological Resources Preservation Act.

Mitigation funding source: BLM base funding or contract funding.

DESIGN FEATURE 11: PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES

If any paleontological resources are discovered during project construction activities - including construction of the scenic overlook, any road improvements, individual and group site clearings, and vault toilet excavations, all work would stop, and the Authorized Officer would be contacted for mitigation measures.

Party(ies) responsible for implementation: Bureau of Land Management

How monitoring information will be made publicly available if appropriate: Freedom of Information Act Requests

Anticipated implementation/completion timeframe: During construction only, which is currently unscheduled but anticipated to occur in May to October in a future year.

The standards for determining compliance: If fossils are encountered, a stop-work order until mitigation can be determined for the find.

The consequences of non-compliance: Consequences for fossil resource damage or destruction are defined by the Paleontological Resources Preservation Act.

Mitigation funding source: BLM base funding or contract funding.

DESIGN FEATURE 12: DUST

To minimize dust-related impacts to air quality, water quality, and vegetation, the BLM would apply dust control measures as required by Utah Administrative Code R307-205-5.

Party(ies) responsible for implementation: Bureau of Land Management.

How monitoring information will be made publicly available if appropriate: Freedom of Information Act Requests.

Anticipated implementation/completion timeframe: During construction only, which is currently unscheduled but anticipated to occur in May to October in a future year.

The standards for determining compliance: Utah Administrative Code R307-205-5 requirements.

The consequences of non-compliance: Consequences for failure to conduct dust control are defined by the Utah Administrative Code R307-205-5.

Mitigation funding source: BLM base funding or contract funding.

DESIGN FEATURE 13: WILDLIFE

All vault toilets would be equipped with wildlife screens over the vent pipe to prevent animals from getting trapped inside.

Party(ies) responsible for implementation: Bureau of Land Management.

How monitoring information will be made publicly available if appropriate: Freedom of Information Act Requests.

Anticipated implementation/completion timeframe: During construction, which is currently unscheduled but anticipated to occur in May to October in a future year. During facility maintenance for the life of the campground as determined necessary through monitoring.

The standards for determining compliance: Installation of the wildlife screens.

The consequences of non-compliance: Consequences for “take” of a migratory bird or raptor are defined by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and enforced by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Deviation from implementation of the design feature as proposed would remain consistent with the management objective of the area for other wildlife species therefore there are no

consequences of non-compliance. However, the effects of non-compliance are stress to and possible mortality of individual wildlife.

Mitigation funding source: BLM base funding or contract funding.

DESIGN FEATURE 14: SIGNAGE

Signage with interpretive and regulatory information would be installed at the campground to educate the public on appropriate techniques for respecting, preserving, and protecting wildlife (including fishes and Mexican spotted owl), archaeological, and paleontological discoveries, and provide campground information. Some signs would provide paleontological collection laws and legal consequences for violators. Some signs would provide education on measures and techniques that should be used to prevent light “pollution” to dark night sky.

Party(ies) responsible for implementation: Bureau of Land Management.

How monitoring information will be made publicly available if appropriate: Freedom of Information Act Requests.

Anticipated implementation/completion timeframe: During construction, which is currently unscheduled but anticipated to occur in May to October in a future year. During sign maintenance for the life of the campground as determined necessary through monitoring.

The standards for determining compliance: Installation and maintenance of the signs.

The consequences of non-compliance: Deviation from implementation of the design feature as proposed would remain consistent with the management objective of the area therefore there are no consequences of non-compliance. However, the effects of non-compliance include visitors ignorance of public land issues and their possible violation of laws for protection of the environment.

Mitigation funding source: BLM base funding or contract funding.

DESIGN FEATURE 15: DARK NIGHT SKY

To prevent impacts to the viewing quality (astronomical) of dark night sky, no campground features would be lighted. All campground features (vault toilets, overlook, and campsites) would be oriented so that no lights should be visible from the Dinosaur National Monument.

Party(ies) responsible for implementation: Bureau of Land Management.

How monitoring information will be made publicly available if appropriate: Freedom of Information Act Requests.

Anticipated implementation/completion timeframe: During construction, which is currently unscheduled but anticipated to occur in May to October in a future year. During facility maintenance for the life of the campground as determined necessary through monitoring.

The standards for determining compliance: No lighted campground features and orientation of the facilities away from the potentially visible Dinosaur National Monument key observation points.

The consequences of non-compliance: Deviation from implementation of the design feature as proposed would remain consistent with the management objective of the area therefore there are no consequences of non-compliance. However, the effects of non-compliance are the potential for light from the campground facilities to be visible from the key observation points.

Mitigation funding source: BLM base funding or contract funding.

DESIGN FEATURE 16: BOLLARDS

Bollards or bollard-and-rail barriers (see section 2.2.1; Figure 2-1) are currently only planned for the proposed group sites. However, once the campground is operational, if the BLM observed continuing resource damage occurring off designated areas (i.e. from users leaving the designated parking area and/ or individual campsites), bollard and rails would be installed around the entire campground.

Party(ies) responsible for implementation: Bureau of Land Management.

How monitoring information will be made publicly available if appropriate: Freedom of Information Act Requests.

Anticipated implementation/completion timeframe: During construction, which is currently unscheduled but anticipated to occur in May to October in a future year. During the life of the campground as determined necessary through monitoring.

The standards for determining compliance: Installation of the bollards, and lack of expansion of the site by campers.

The consequences of non-compliance: Deviation from implementation of the design feature as proposed would remain consistent with the management objective of the area therefore there are no consequences of non-compliance. However, the effects of non-compliance are the potential for visitors to expand the campground.

Mitigation funding source: BLM base funding or contract funding.